

REMARKS

This Amendment is in response to the Official Action mailed February 26, 2003, the shortened statutory period for filing a response having expired on May 26, 2003. In this regard, Applicant submits herewith a three-month extension petition to reset the deadline for responding to the Official Action to and including August 26, 2003. In view of the above amendments and below remarks, reconsideration of the Examiner's rejection is respectfully requested.

The Examiner has raised various objections to the drawings, *inter alia*, under 37 C.F.R. § 1.84(p)(5) and 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a). Applicant submits herewith corrected drawings which overcome the objections other than those raised under 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a). Applicant has also amended the specification to identify reference numerals 188 and 200 as indicated in Fig. 11B and Fig. 12B, respectively. As to reference element 306 in Fig. 9, the Examiner is directed to paragraph 0067 which makes reference to this element as a plug attached to the cable 304.

As to the objection under 37 C.F.R. § 1.83 (a), Applicant submits herewith proposed new figures 18 and 19 which illustrate the subject matter recited in dependent claims 30 and 41 (Fig. 18) and with respect to the subject matter of claims 32 and 43 (Fig. 19). Support for the proposed new Figures 18 and 19 are set forth in the aforementioned claims, as well as Applicant's specification in paragraph 0063 and 0064. Accordingly, no new matter is present in the newly proposed figures.

The Examiner has objected to claims 22-33 based upon the informality regarding the first end coupling and the second end coupling. Applicant has amended the claims to be consistent with the description in Applicant's specification.

The Examiner has also rejected claims 32-44 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicant regards as the invention. Applicant has amended independent claim 34 to provide the antecedent basis as suggested by the Examiner.

In accordance with the Examiner's objection, Applicant submits herewith a new abstract for this application.

The present application includes claims 22-44, of which claims 22-26, 28, 30, 32-37, 39, 41, 43 and 44 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by *Chirico et al.*, United States Patent No. 6,095,468. The Examiner refers to extension arm 30 in *Chirico et al.* as corresponding to the claimed forearm extension having a first end coupling 46 provided with an opening 260 in wall 220, See Figs. 2 and 3. Notwithstanding the foregoing, *Chirico et al.* does not anticipate nor render obvious the construction of Applicant's forearm extension as set forth in claims 22 through 49, and specifically, independent claims 22 and 34.

More specifically, the extension arm 30 of *Chirico et al.* is not intended to mount a device thereto, such as an electronic device. Rather, the extension arm is coupled to a ceiling to function along with arm 32 as a service column for electrical lines. This is contrary to the claimed forearm extension wherein one end of the forearm extension is adapted to be attached to an electronic device, and the other end of the forearm extension includes a coupling having a slot formed in a wall thereof so that the coupling and the body of the forearm extension are in communication with each other through the slot, as set forth in claims 22 and 34. Thus, *Chirico et al.* is considered non-analogous prior art as (1) it is not within the filed of Applicant's endeavor and (2) is not reasonably

pertinent to the particular problem with which the Applicant was involved. *In re Deminski*, 230 U.S.P.Q. 313 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

Contrary to the Examiner's position, *Chirico et al.* does not provide an opening which allows cables to enter the coupling from outside the extension arm. In this regard, the bottom of the coupling 46 in *Chirico et al.* is obstructed by the bottom wall 72 forming the extension arm, See Fig. 5. Accordingly, cables pass through the extension arm in *Chirico et al.* and into the coupling through its side opening, as opposed to entering the coupling through a bottom opening within the coupling and exiting a sidewall opening as claimed by Applicant.

As shown in Fig. 16B of Applicant's drawings, a slot 274 is formed within the sidewall 214 of the first end coupling so that the coupling and the body 208 are in internal communication with each other through the slot. As shown in Fig. 9, this permits the passage of a cable 304 through the interior of the first end coupling, through the slot 274 and into the interior of the body 208. This feature is set forth in Applicant's independent claims 22 and 34 wherein the first end coupling is provided with a wall defining an enclosed region and provided with a slot formed therein. Accordingly, a cable is adapted for passage through the open bottom end of the coupling, into the enclosed region of the coupling, through the slot, and into the interior of the hollow body forming a portion of the forearm extension. As previously discussed, *Chirico et al.* does not provide a corresponding structure for Applicant's claimed first end coupling. The Examiner's rejection is considered traverse and should therefore be withdrawn.

In considering Applicant's within response, Applicant designates the rejected dependent claims as being allowable by virtue of their ultimate dependency upon submittedly allowable independent claims. Although Applicant has not separately

Application No.: 10/079,804

Docket No.: INNOFF 3.0-010 DIV

argued the patentability of each of the dependent claims, Applicant's failure to do so is not to be taken as an admission that the features of the dependent claims are not themselves separably patentable over the prior art cited by the Examiner.

Applicant brings to the attention of the Examiner the existence of Applicant's co-pending Application Serial Nos. 10/305,565 filed November 27, 2002 and 10/448,769 filed May 30, 2003, which are related to the claimed subject matter of this application.

As it is believed that all of the rejections set forth in the Official Action have been fully met, favorable reconsideration and allowance are earnestly solicited.

If, however, for any reason the Examiner does not believe that such action can be taken at this time, it is respectfully requested that she telephone Applicant's attorney at (908) 654-5000 in order to overcome any additional objections which she might have.

If there are any additional charges in connection with this requested amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 12-1095 therefor.

Dated: August 26, 2003

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Stephen B. Goldman

Registration No.: 28,512

LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,

KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP

600 South Avenue West

Westfield, New Jersey 07090

(908) 654-5000

Attorneys for Applicant